

GENERAL METHODS TO CONTROL RIGHT-INVARIANT SYSTEMS ON COMPACT LIE GROUPS AND MULTILEVEL QUANTUM SYSTEMS

Domenico D'Alessandro*

April 17, 2009

Abstract

For a right-invariant system on a compact Lie group G , I present two methods to design a control to drive the state from the identity to any element of the group. The first method, under appropriate assumptions, achieves *exact* control to the target but requires estimation of the ‘size’ of a neighborhood of the identity in G . The second method, does not involve any mathematical difficulty, and obtains control to a desired target *with arbitrary accuracy*. A third method is then given combining the main ideas of the previous methods. This is also very simple in its formulation and turns out to be generically more efficient as illustrated by one of the examples we consider.

The methods described in the paper provide arbitrary constructive control for any right-invariant system on a compact Lie group. I give examples including closed multilevel quantum systems and lossless electrical networks. In particular, the results can be applied to the coherent control of general multilevel quantum systems.

*Department of Mathematics, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, U.S.A. Electronic address: daless@iastate.edu

1 The Lie algebra rank condition of geometric control theory

Consider a control system of the form

$$\dot{x} = f(x, u), \quad (1)$$

where x is the state varying on a compact Lie group and u the control. The system is said to be *right invariant* if, denoting by $x(t, u, s)$ the solution of (1) corresponding to initial condition s and control function u , we have

$$x(t, u, s) = x(t, u, \mathbf{1}) \circ s, \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{1}$ denotes the identity of the group and $\circ$ is the multiplication of the group. To be concrete, we shall consider the case of matrix groups where the group operation is the standard matrix multiplication, with particular attention to subgroups of $SU(n)$, given the potential application to quantum systems. In particular, we shall consider systems of the form

$$\dot{X} = A(u)X, \quad X(0) = \mathbf{1}, \quad (3)$$

where $\mathbf{1}$ is the identity matrix and the matrix $A(u)$ is in the Lie algebra associated with G for every value of the control u . This equation models many systems of interest. In particular closed (i.e., not interacting with the environment) finite dimensional quantum systems which are coherently controlled (i.e., through a variation of their Hamiltonian) are modeled this way. In this case, equation (3) is Schrödinger equation. We refer to [7] and references therein for several examples and introductory notions on Lie groups and Lie algebras in the context of quantum control.

If we restrict ourselves to piecewise constant controls, the problem of control for systems (3) can be described as follows. Assume that we have a linearly independent set of matrices

$$\mathcal{F} := \{A_1, \dots, A_m\}. \quad (4)$$

To each of them there corresponds a semigroup

$$\mathcal{S}_j := \{e^{A_j t} | t \geq 0\}, \quad j = 1, \dots, m. \quad (5)$$

The problem of control to a matrix X_f is to choose N elements X_l , $l = 1, \dots, N \in \mathcal{S}_j$, for some $j = 1, \dots, m$, such that $\prod_{l=1}^N X_l = X_f$. If such elements exist X_f is said to be *reachable*. The question of the set of reachable matrices is a standard one in geometric control theory. The result in the following Theorem 1, known as the *Lie algebra rank condition*, is classical [11] and provides the answer for compact Lie groups.

Let $\mathcal{L}$ be the Lie algebra generated by the elements in $\mathcal{F}$ defined as the smallest Lie algebra containing $\mathcal{F}$ and denote by $e^{\mathcal{L}}$ the connected Lie group associated with $\mathcal{L}$. We shall call $\mathcal{L}$ the *dynamical Lie algebra* associated to the system.

Theorem 1 [11] *Consider the Lie group $e^{\mathcal{L}}$ and assume it is compact. Then, the set of reachable values for X in (3) is equal to $e^{\mathcal{L}}$.*

This result has been elaborated upon in several papers and applied to quantum mechanical systems (cf. [1], [7], [10], [18]). In particular, in the case of (closed) quantum mechanical systems $\mathcal{L}$ is a subalgebra of the unitary Lie algebra $u(n)$ and, as such, can be written as the direct sum of an Abelian subalgebra and a semisimple subalgebra to which there corresponds a compact Lie group. That is, modulo an Abelian subgroup which commutes with all of $e^{\mathcal{L}}$, $e^{\mathcal{L}}$ is compact (cf. [6] and [17]). In particular, $e^{\mathcal{L}}$ is compact if $\mathcal{L} = u(n)$ or $\mathcal{L} = su(n)$ in which case, the system is called controllable and $e^{\mathcal{L}}$ is the group of unitary matrices $U(n)$ or special unitary matrices $SU(n)$, respectively.

The original proof given in [11] is not constructive, i.e., in our setting, it does not show how to alternate elements in the semigroups $\mathcal{S}_j$ in (5) to obtain a given target $X_f \in e^{\mathcal{L}}$. We show how to obtain this in two ways in the following two sections. The main ideas are then combined in a third method in section 4. The first method, described in section 2, achieves exact control if the subgroups corresponding to the semigroups in (5), i.e.,

$$\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_j := \{e^{A_j t} | t \in \mathbf{R}\}, \quad j = 1, \dots, m, \quad (6)$$

are closed. Otherwise it obtains control with arbitrary accuracy as it follows from Proposition 2.1 and Remark 2.2 below. This proposition allows us to replace an exponential of the form e^{At} with $t < 0$ with an exponential of the form e^{At} with $t > 0$ which approximates it with arbitrary accuracy. This result will be utilized for the following two methods as well.

2 Method 1: Exact constructive controllability

The method we are going to describe is a consequence of the proof of the Lie algebra rank condition, Theorem 1, given in [7] and the result on uniform finite generation of compact Lie groups given in [5]. Let $X_f \in e^{\mathcal{L}}$ be the target state. We want to show a way to obtain X_f as a product of elements in (5), if not exactly, at least, with arbitrary accuracy. We are first going to relax the problem by allowing the use of elements in the subgroups (6) rather than only elements of the semigroups (5). We shall show later how to overcome this problem (see Proposition 2.1 and Remark 2.2).

Since $e^{\mathcal{L}}$ is compact the exponential map is surjective, that is, there exists a matrix $A \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $e^A = X_f$, for every X_f .¹ This also implies that, given any neighborhood K of the identity in $e^{\mathcal{L}}$, we can choose an integer M sufficiently large such that $e^{\frac{A}{M}} = X_f^{\frac{1}{M}} \in K$. Now, assume first that $\mathcal{F}$ is a basis for $\mathcal{L}$, that is, no Lie bracket is necessary to obtain a basis of $\mathcal{L}$. This implies that, by varying $t_1, \dots, t_m$ in a neighborhood of the origin in $\mathbf{R}^m$, $K := \{X = e^{A_s t_s} e^{A_{m-1} t_{m-1}} \dots e^{A_1 t_1} | t_1, \dots, t_m \in \mathbf{R}\}$, gives a neighborhood

¹See, e.g., [14] and [16] for a study on the generalization of this result. See also [9] (Theorem 6.4.15) for the theorem on existence of the logarithm of a matrix.

of the identity in $e^{\mathcal{L}}$ and, in particular, it contains $e^{\frac{A}{M}}$ for sufficiently large M . That is, we can find real values $\bar{t}_1, \dots, \bar{t}_m$ such that

$$e^{\frac{A}{M}} = e^{A_m \bar{t}_m} e^{A_{m-1} \bar{t}_{m-1}} \dots e^{A_1 \bar{t}_1}. \quad (7)$$

Therefore, by using elements from the subgroups (6) we can obtain $e^{\frac{A}{M}}$. Now assume $\mathcal{F}$ is not a basis for $\mathcal{L}$. Since $\mathcal{F} := \{A_1, \dots, A_m\}$ generates all of $\mathcal{L}$, there exist two values $1 \leq k, l \leq m$ such that the commutator $[A_l, A_k]$ is linearly independent of $\{A_1, \dots, A_m\}$. This implies that there exists a value $t \in \mathbf{R}$ such that $F := e^{A_l t} A_k e^{-A_l t}$ is also linearly independent. To see this, assume it is not true and write $e^{A_l t} A_k e^{-A_l t}$ as

$$e^{A_l t} A_k e^{-A_l t} = \sum_{j=1}^m a_j(t) A_j, \quad (8)$$

for every t . Taking the derivative with respect to t at $t = 0$, gives $[A_l, A_k] = \sum_{j=1}^m \dot{a}_j(0) A_j$, which contradicts the fact that $[A_l, A_k]$ is linearly independent of $\{A_1, \dots, A_m\}$. Let $\bar{t}$ be such that

$$F := e^{A_l \bar{t}} A_k e^{-A_l \bar{t}}. \quad (9)$$

We can add F to $\{A_1, \dots, A_m\}$ and still have a linearly independent set. Moreover, we can express every exponential e^{Ft} in terms of exponentials of A_l and A_k since $e^{Ft} = e^{A_l \bar{t}} e^{A_k t} e^{-A_l \bar{t}}$. Define $A_{m+1} := F$. If $\{A_1, \dots, A_m, A_{m+1}\}$ is a basis of $\mathcal{L}$ then we can proceed as above and obtain a neighborhood of the identity in $e^{\mathcal{L}}$ by varying $\{t_1, \dots, t_{m+1}\} \in \mathbf{R}^{m+1}$. Such a neighborhood is given by $K := \{\prod_{j=1}^{m+1} e^{A_j t_j} | t_1, \dots, t_{m+1} \in \mathbf{R}\}$. If that is not the case, then we observe that $\{A_1, \dots, A_{m+1}\}$ is still a set of generators for $\mathcal{L}$ and, as above, there must exist two elements A_k and A_l in $\{A_1, \dots, A_{m+1}\}$, such that $[A_k, A_l]$ is linearly independent of $\{A_1, \dots, A_{m+1}\}$ and therefore for some $\bar{t}$, $A_{m+2} := e^{A_l \bar{t}} A_k e^{-A_l \bar{t}}$ is linearly independent of $\{A_1, \dots, A_{m+1}\}$. The exponential $e^{A_{m+2} t}$ again can be expressed in terms of exponentials of $A_1, \dots, A_{m+1}$ and therefore in terms of exponentials of $A_1, \dots, A_m$. Proceeding this way, one finds $\dim(\mathcal{L}) - m$ new matrices, $\{A_{m+1}, A_{m+2}, \dots, A_{\dim(\mathcal{L})}\}$ which together with $\{A_1, \dots, A_m\}$ form a basis for $\mathcal{L}$. By taking $\prod_{j=1}^{\dim(\mathcal{L})} e^{A_j t_j}$ with $t_j \in \mathbf{R}$, $j = 1, \dots, \dim(\mathcal{L})$, we obtain all the elements in a neighborhood of the identity and in particular $e^{\frac{A}{M}}$. Repeating the sequence M times we obtain e^A .

In the expression of $e^{\frac{A}{M}}$ and therefore in the expression of e^A , there will be some exponentials with negative t , i.e., some elements in the subgroups (6) which are (possibly) not in the semigroups (5). There are ways to minimize the number of these elements in the full product, for example by placing together matrices which come from similarity transformations with the same matrix so as to have cancelations of the type $e^{A_j t_1} e^{-A_j t_2} = e^{A_j(t_1 - t_2)}$. Also, in many cases, the orbits $\{e^{A_j t} | t \in \mathbf{R}\}$ are periodic (closed), which allows us to assume all the $\bar{t}_j$'s positive, without loss of generality. However, if this is not the case we can use the following fact.

Proposition 2.1 Let $e^{-B|t|}$ an element of a compact Lie group $e^{\mathcal{L}}$. For every $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a $\bar{t} > 0$ such that²

$$\|e^{-B|t|} - e^{B\bar{t}}\| < \epsilon. \quad (10)$$

Proof. Consider $e^{-B|t|}$ and the sequence $e^{nB|t|}$, which by compactness of $e^{\mathcal{L}}$ has a converging subsequence $e^{n(k)B|t|}$. We have $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} e^{(n(k+1)-n(k)-1)B|t|} = e^{-B|t|}$. Therefore there is $\bar{k}$ such that $\|e^{(n(\bar{k}+1)-n(\bar{k})-1)B|t|} - e^{-B|t|}\| < \epsilon$, and the proposition holds with $\bar{t} = (n(\bar{k}+1) - n(\bar{k}) - 1)|t|$. $\square$

Remark 2.2 The proof given above follows the one given in [11]. A different, more concrete, proof can be given for Lie subgroups of $U(n)$, which is the case that interests us the most. In that case, using the Frobenius norm of matrices, we have

$$\|e^{B\bar{t}} - e^{-B|t|}\| = \sqrt{2} \sqrt{n - \sum_{j=1}^n \cos(\omega_j(\bar{t} + |t|))}, \quad (11)$$

where $i\omega_j$, $j = 1, \dots, n$ are the eigenvalues (possibly repeated) of B . If we can choose $\bar{t} > 0$ so that

$$[1 - \cos(\omega_j(\bar{t} + |t|))] < \frac{\epsilon^2}{2n}, \quad (12)$$

for every $j = 1, \dots, n$, then (10) is certainly satisfied. If $g := \arccos\left(1 - \frac{\epsilon^2}{2n}\right)$, then, we satisfy condition (12) if we are able to find $\bar{t}$ and integers m_j , $j = 1, \dots, n$ such that

$$|\omega_j(\bar{t} + |t|) - 2\pi m_j| < g. \quad (13)$$

However, according to Dirichlet's approximation theorem (see, e.g., [2]), given a natural number N and n reals $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$, we can find positive integers $a, b_1, \dots, b_n$, with $1 \leq a \leq N^n$ so that $|\alpha_j a - b_j| < \frac{1}{N}$. This result can be applied to satisfy condition (13) identifying α_j with $\frac{\omega_j|t|}{2\pi}$ and choosing $\frac{1}{N} < \frac{g}{2\pi}$ and choosing $m_j = b_j$ and $\bar{t}$ so that $\frac{\bar{t}+|t|}{|t|} = a$. Notice that since $a \geq 1$, $\bar{t} \geq 0$ as desired. For the problem to find a and b_j 's, there are several algorithms in the literature (cf. [12] and [13]). Notice, in any case, that we are only interested in a , which determines $\bar{t}$, and since a is bounded from above by N^n , it can be always found, in principle, by exhaustive search.

We can summarize the given method as follows:

1. Given $\mathcal{F} := \{A_1, \dots, A_m\}$ find, via similarity transformations, $\dim \mathcal{L} - m$ more matrices $\{A_{m+1}, \dots, A_{\dim(\mathcal{L})}\}$ so that $\{A_1, \dots, A_{\dim(\mathcal{L})}\}$ is a basis for $\mathcal{L}$.
2. Take the (principal) logarithm of X_f , A , so that $e^A = X_f$.

²Whenever we do specific computations involving norms of matrices we use the Frobenius norm $\|A\| := \sqrt{\text{Trace}(AA^\dagger)}$.

3. Find M (sufficiently large) and $t_1, \dots, t_{\dim(\mathcal{L})}$, so that

$$e^{\frac{A}{M}} = \prod_{j=1}^{\dim(\mathcal{L})} e^{A_j t_j}. \quad (14)$$

Then $X_f = e^A = \left(\prod_{j=1}^{\dim(\mathcal{L})} e^{A_j t_j} \right)^M$.

4. Replace the exponentials of the matrices $A_{m+1}, \dots, A_{\dim(\mathcal{L})}$ with expressions involving the exponentials of $\{A_1, \dots, A_m\}$ as obtained from step 1.
5. Replace every exponential e^{Bt} , ($B \in \mathcal{F}$) involving negative t with its approximation involving positive t . This can be obtained with arbitrary accuracy according to Proposition 2.1 and Remark 2.2.

Remark 2.3 In the above procedure, step 3. is decidedly the most difficult one since it requires the solution of nonlinear equations involving the exponentials of matrices. The solution is guaranteed to exist for M sufficiently large. This task is obviously easier for low dimensional systems. It must be remarked however that there is some flexibility in the choice of the matrices $A_{m+1}, \dots, A_{\dim(\mathcal{L})}$, because of the choice of the pair A_k, A_l and of the times $\bar{t}$ (cf. (9)). We can use this flexibility to make these matrices as simple as possible (e.g., block diagonal, sparse, etc.) so that calculating the exponential is easier. Another type of flexibility, which may be used in calculations, is the fact that the way exponentials are arranged in (14) is arbitrary. Any different order will give a neighborhood of the identity also. The methods described in the following two sections do not present this problem.

Remark 2.4 The last step of the method can be achieved exactly (i.e., without involving an approximation) if the orbit associated with the given matrices $\mathcal{F} := \{A_1, \dots, A_m\}$ are periodic. In this respect, notice that, if this is the case, all the other matrices obtained by the method also have associated periodic orbits (their eigenvalues are the same as the ones of the original matrices). Therefore, for a given matrix B , and negative $\bar{t}$, we can choose a positive t , such that $e^{Bt} = e^{B\bar{t}}$.

Remark 2.5 [5] It is interesting to give an upper bound to the number of exponentials involved in obtaining a neighborhood of the identity according to the described method. Let us assume that, at every step, we only produce one new linearly independent matrix. For the given matrices $\{A_1, \dots, A_m\}$, we need only one exponential, but for the matrix obtained at step 1 we need three exponentials. In general, at step j , $j \geq 2$, the worst case scenario is when we combine a matrix obtained at step $j-1$ (giving the similarity transformation (A_l in (9)), which requires d_{j-1} exponentials, with a matrix obtained at step $j-2$, which requires d_{j-2} exponentials. The total number of exponentials at step j is therefore $d_j = 2d_{j-1} + d_{j-2}$. Therefore having defined recursively the numbers d_j as

$$d_0 = 1, \quad d_1 = 3, \quad d_j = 2d_{j-1} + d_{j-2}, \quad (15)$$

the number of exponentials required is

$$md_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{\dim \mathcal{L} - m} d_j. \quad (16)$$

2.1 Example

We illustrate this method with a simple example of the quantum control of a two level system, i.e., a control problem on $SU(2)$, which is compact. Recall the definition of the Pauli matrices

$$\sigma_x := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma_y := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & i \\ -i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma_z := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (17)$$

Let $\mathcal{F} := \{A_1, A_2\}$, with $A_1 := i\sigma_z$ and $A_2 := i(\sigma_x + \sigma_y)$. Calculate $e^{A_1 \bar{t}} A_2 e^{-A_1 \bar{t}}$ which for $\bar{t} = -\frac{3}{8}\pi$ gives $A_3 = -i\sqrt{2}\sigma_y$, which is linearly independent of A_1 and A_2 , and along with them it forms a basis of $su(2)$. A straightforward calculation gives

$$e^{A_1 t_1} = \begin{pmatrix} e^{it_1} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-it_1} \end{pmatrix}, \quad e^{A_2 t_2} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\sqrt{2}t_2) & e^{i\frac{3\pi}{4}} \sin(\sqrt{2}t_2) \\ -e^{-i\frac{3\pi}{4}} \sin(\sqrt{2}t_2) & \cos(\sqrt{2}t_2) \end{pmatrix} \quad (18)$$

$$e^{A_3 t_3} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\sqrt{2}t_3) & \sin(\sqrt{2}t_3) \\ -\sin(\sqrt{2}t_3) & \cos(\sqrt{2}t_3) \end{pmatrix}.$$

and the the set

$$S_{1,2,3} := \{e^{A_1 t_1} e^{A_2 t_2} e^{A_3 t_3} \mid t_1, t_2, t_3 \in \mathbf{R}\}, \quad (19)$$

covers a neighborhood of the identity in $SU(2)$. Assume now our target state X_f is

$$X_f := \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & i\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \\ i\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (20)$$

We first try to see if X_f is in the set $S_{1,2,3}$ in (19). Therefore we must be able to choose t_1 and t_3 so that $P := e^{-A_1 t_1} X_f e^{-A_3 t_3}$ has the form $e^{A_2 t_2}$. This means in particular that the difference between the phases of the $P_{1,2}$ element and $P_{1,1}$ elements in P is $\frac{3\pi}{4}$. As a straightforward calculation shows, $P_{1,2} P_{1,1}^* = \frac{i}{2}$ independently of the choice of t_1 and t_3 . Therefore $X_f \notin S_{1,2,3}$. We replace X_f with $X_f^{\frac{1}{2}}$. The same calculation shows that, for every t_1 , $P_{1,2} P_{1,1}^* = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \sin(2\sqrt{2}t_3) + i\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}$ and, therefore, the choice $t_3 := \frac{3\pi}{4\sqrt{2}}$ achieves the desired phase difference. Then, we can choose t_1 to impose that the element $P_{1,1}$ has phase zero (it is real). This leads to $t_1 = \frac{9\pi}{8}$. With these choices, we have

$$e^{-A_1 t_1} X_f^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-A_3 t_3} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} e^{i\frac{3\pi}{4}} \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} e^{-i\frac{3\pi}{4}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (21)$$

Comparing this with $e^{A_2 t_2}$ in (18) leads to the choice $t_2 = \frac{\pi}{4\sqrt{2}}$. With these choices $X_f = \left(e^{A_1 t_1} e^{A_2 t_2} e^{A_3 t_3}\right)^2$.

In terms of the original available matrices, A_1 and A_2 , we have

$$X_f = \left(e^{A_1 t_1} e^{A_2 t_2} e^{-A_1 \frac{3\pi}{8}} e^{A_2 t_3} e^{A_1 \frac{3\pi}{8}} \right)^2, \quad (22)$$

where t_1, t_2, t_3 are the ones found above. The presence of the negative ‘time’ $-\frac{3\pi}{8}$ in the third exponential, does not pose any problems since the one dimensional subgroup associated with A_1 (as well as any other matrix in $su(2)$) is periodic.

A similar treatment shows that, had we chosen to work with the set

$$S_{1,3,2} := \{ e^{A_1 t_1} e^{A_3 t_3} e^{A_2 t_2} \mid t_1, t_2, t_3 \in \mathbf{R} \}, \quad (23)$$

we would have achieved X_f with just three exponentials. This shows that the order in which the exponentials are chosen may be important.

It must be said that for the special case of $SU(2)$ there are many more techniques which may be preferable to the one advocated here. For example, since one has available both $i\sigma_z$ and $i\sigma_y$ one could have applied a simple Euler decomposition. In general it is also possible, for general target matrices, to find the factorization with the minimum number of factors [4]. Our goal here was to illustrate the method on a simple, easily computable, case. We remark that even for large dimensional Lie groups, one can combine these ideas with Lie group decompositions for which there exists a large set of tools [7].

3 Method 2: Constructive controllability with arbitrarily small error

In this and the following section we illustrate methods which do not require the solution of nonlinear algebraic equations, such as (7), but can be implemented with simple linear algebraic techniques. The algorithms achieve control to the target with arbitrary small error.

Reconsider the available set of matrices $\mathcal{F}$ in (4). As before, we relax the requirement to use only elements in the semigroups (5) and use elements in the subgroups (6). We can then replace elements in the subgroups with elements in the semigroups as done in the previous section. We start with a definition

Definition 3.1 A matrix H is said to be *simulable* with the set $\mathcal{F}$ if there exist r continuous, strictly increasing, functions f_j , $j = 1, \dots, r$, with $f_j(0) = 0$, defined in an interval $[0, \epsilon)$, such that

$$e^{Hx} = \prod_{j=1}^r e^{L_j f_j(x)} + O(x^{1+\delta}), \quad (24)$$

for some matrices $L_j \in \mathcal{F} \cup -\mathcal{F}$ and³ a $\delta > 0$.

³ $-\mathcal{F}$ denotes the set $\{-A_1, -A_2, \dots, -A_m\}$.

If a matrix H is simulable, we can control from the identity to e^H with the desired accuracy using elements in the subgroups (6) (and therefore of the semigroups (5)).

Lemma 3.2 Assume (24) holds. Then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\prod_{j=1}^r e^{L_j f_j(\frac{1}{n})} \right)^n = e^H \quad (25)$$

Proof. If (24) holds then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\prod_{j=1}^r e^{L_j f_j(\frac{1}{n})} \right)^n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[e^{H \frac{1}{n}} - O\left(\frac{1}{n^{1+\delta}}\right) \right]^n. \quad (26)$$

However, we have this standard limit in matrix analysis (see, [9] section 6.5)

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[e^{H \frac{1}{n}} - O\left(\frac{1}{n^{1+\delta}}\right) \right]^n = e^H, \quad (27)$$

which proves the lemma. $\square$

From the point of view of constructive controllability, this lemma says that, for each simulable H , we can put together a product of exponentials of elements in $\mathcal{F}$ which, repeated a large enough number of times, approximates, with arbitrary accuracy, e^H .

Theorem 2 Every H in the dynamical Lie algebra $\mathcal{L}$ is simulable.

Remark 3.3 This theorem along with Lemma 3.2 and Proposition 2.1 give an alternative proof of a slightly weaker form of the Lie algebra rank condition of Theorem 1. Since $e^{\mathcal{L}}$ is compact, for every X_f in $e^{\mathcal{L}}$, there exists an $H \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $e^H = X_f$. Theorem 2 and Lemma 3.2 say that we can find a sequence of reachable points converging to X_f for every X_f . Therefore the set of reachable states is dense in $e^{\mathcal{L}}$.

Remark 3.4 Elaborating on the proof of the Theorem 2, we will also show how to choose the elements $L_j \in \mathcal{F} \cup -\mathcal{F}$ and the functions f_j in (24) so as to make the controllability result constructive. We shall discuss this after the proof.

Proof. The proof is similar to the one given in [3] in the context of quantum walks dynamics. In particular, we will show that the set of simulable elements H is a Lie algebra containing $\mathcal{F}$ and this will be sufficient since $\mathcal{L}$ is the smallest Lie algebra containing $\mathcal{F}$, by definition.

First of all, it is clear that every element in $\mathcal{F}$ is simulable, since equation (24) holds with $r = 1$ and $O \equiv 0$. Therefore the set of simulable matrices contains $\mathcal{F}$.

Moreover if H satisfies equation (24), then we have

$$e^{-Hx} = \prod_{j=r}^1 e^{-L_j f_j(x)} - \prod_{j=r}^1 e^{-L_j f_j(x)} O(x^{1+\delta}) e^{-Hx}, \quad (28)$$

and by expanding the exponentials it follows that the last term is also an $O(x^{1+\delta})$. Therefore $-H$ is also simulable. Moreover, for $a \geq 0$, (24) holds for aH with $f_j(x)$ replaced by $f_j(ax)$ and $O(x^{1+\delta})$ replaced by $O(a^{1+\delta}x^{1+\delta}) = O(x^{1+\delta})$. If (24) holds for H_1 and H_2 , i.e., we have

$$e^{H_i x} = \prod_{j=1}^{r_i} e^{L_j^i f_j^i(x)} + O_i(x^{1+\delta_i}), \quad i = 1, 2, \quad (29)$$

combining this with

$$e^{(H_1+H_2)x} + O(x^2) = e^{H_1 x} e^{H_2 x}, \quad (30)$$

gives⁴

$$e^{(H_1+H_2)x} = \prod_{j=1}^{r_2} e^{L_j^2 f_j^2(x)} \prod_{j=1}^{r_2} e^{L_j^1 f_j^1(x)} + O(x^{1+\delta}), \quad (31)$$

with $\delta = \min\{\delta_1, \delta_2, 1\}$. Therefore, if H_1 and H_2 are simulable, so is $H_1 + H_2$. These arguments show that the set of simulable matrices is a vector space.

To show that it is also a Lie algebra, we have to show that if H_1 and H_2 are both simulable so is $[H_1, H_2]$. In order to see that, write (29) in the form

$$e^{H_1 t} = T_1(t) + O_1(t^{1+\delta_1}), \quad e^{H_2 t} = T_2(t) + O_2(t^{1+\delta_2}), \quad (32)$$

i.e., by replacing the products with the functions T_1 and T_2 . This also gives (cf. (28))

$$e^{-H_1 t} = T_1^{-1}(t) - T_1^{-1}(t) O_1(t^{1+\delta_1}) e^{-H_1 t}, \quad e^{-H_2 t} = T_2^{-1}(t) - T_2^{-1}(t) O_2(t^{1+\delta_2}) e^{-H_2 t}. \quad (33)$$

We use the exponential formula (see, e.g., [9] Section 6.5)

$$e^{[H_1, H_2]t^2} + O(t^3) = e^{-H_1 t} e^{-H_2 t} e^{H_1 t} e^{H_2 t}. \quad (34)$$

Using (32) and (33) in (34), we have

$$e^{[H_1, H_2]t^2} + O(t^3) = (T_1^{-1} - T_1^{-1} O_1 e^{-H_1 t}) (T_2^{-1} - T_2^{-1} O_2 e^{-H_2 t}) (T_1 + O_1) (T_2 + O_2). \quad (35)$$

Expanding the right hand side, omitting terms that are clearly $O(t^\alpha)$, $\alpha > 2$, since they contain the product of two O functions, we have

$$\begin{aligned} e^{[H_1, H_2]t^2} + O(t^3) &= T_1^{-1} T_2^{-1} T_1 T_2 + T_1^{-1} T_2^{-1} T_1 O_2 + T_1^{-1} T_2^{-1} O_1 T_2 \\ &\quad - T_1^{-1} T_2^{-1} O_2 e^{-H_2 t} T_1 T_2 + T_1^{-1} O_1 e^{-H_1 t} T_2^{-1} T_1 T_2 + O(t^\alpha). \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

⁴Here and elsewhere, we use the notation O for a generic O -function and we use indexes like in O_1 and O_2 when we want to highlight a particular O -function.

Expanding in McLaurin series the functions multiplying the O_1 and O_2 , we see that the terms corresponding to the first terms of the expansion cancel, leaving only terms of the form $O(t^{\beta'})$ with $\beta' > 2$. In conclusion, we have

$$e^{[H_1, H_2]t^2} = T_1^{-1}(t)T_2^{-1}(t)T_1(t)T_2(t) + O(t^\beta), \quad \beta > 2, \quad (37)$$

and by setting $t = \sqrt{x}$, we obtain

$$e^{[H_1, H_2]x} = T_1^{-1}(\sqrt{x})T_2^{-1}(\sqrt{x})T_1(\sqrt{x})T_2(\sqrt{x}) + O(x^{\frac{\beta}{2}}), \quad \beta > 0, \quad (38)$$

which shows that $[H_1, H_2]$ is simulable as well, and completes the proof. $\square$

In order to use Lemma 3.2 and Theorem 2 for control, we need to show, given H , how to find the matrices L_j in $\mathcal{F} \cup -\mathcal{F}$ so that (24) holds. We first find a basis of $\mathcal{L}$ by taking repeated Lie brackets of elements in $\mathcal{F}$. More precisely, set

$$\mathcal{D}_0 := \mathcal{F}, \quad (39)$$

a linearly independent set of elements of ‘depth’ 0 (no Lie bracket necessary), and let

$$\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_1 := [\mathcal{D}_0, \mathcal{F}], \quad (40)$$

a set of elements of depth 1, which are Lie brackets of elements of depth 0 with elements of $\mathcal{F}$. From the set $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_1$ we extract a possibly smaller set $\mathcal{D}_1$ such that $\mathcal{D}_0 \cup \mathcal{D}_1$ is a maximal linearly independent set in $\mathcal{D}_0 \cup \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_1$. Proceeding this way, we now calculate a set of Lie brackets of depth 2

$$\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_2 := [\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{F}], \quad (41)$$

and extract a subset $\mathcal{D}_2 \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_2$ so that $\mathcal{D}_0 \cup \mathcal{D}_1 \cup \mathcal{D}_2$ is a maximal linearly independent set in $\mathcal{D}_0 \cup \mathcal{D}_1 \cup \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_2$. Proceeding this way, we obtain a set $\bigcup_{k=0}^r \mathcal{D}_k$, which spans all of $\mathcal{L}$. As a consequence of $\mathcal{L}$ being finite dimensional, the procedure will end at some finite depth r after which we cannot find any new linearly independent matrix. We write, for $k = 0, \dots, r$,

$$\mathcal{D}_k := \{D_{1k}, D_{2k}, \dots, D_{n_k k}\}. \quad (42)$$

We can decompose H as

$$H = \sum_{k=0}^r H_k, \quad (43)$$

with H_k a linear combination of elements of depth k , that is,

$$H_k := \sum_{j=1}^{n_k} \alpha_{kj} D_{jk}. \quad (44)$$

Now, following the proof of the theorem, we can write

$$e^{Hx} = \prod_{k=0}^r e^{H_k x} + O(x^{1+\delta}). \quad (45)$$

Then we can write each of the $e^{H_k x}$ as

$$e^{H_k x} = \prod_{j=1}^{n_k} e^{D_{jk} f_j(x)} + O(x^{1+\delta_k}), \quad (46)$$

for some $\delta_k > 0$. This is straightforward for $k = 0$ and it has to be done iteratively for Lie brackets of higher depth following the procedure indicated in the proof of theorem. Summarizing the method is as follows:

1. Find a basis for $\mathcal{L}$ by repeated Lie brackets of elements of $\mathcal{F}$. Let r denote the maximum depth.
2. Expand H as a sum of linear combinations of matrices of depth $0, 1, \dots$, as in (43), (44).
3. For each of these linear combinations approximate the exponential with a product of exponentials involving elements in the basis according to the proof of theorem 2. In particular the rules to obtain the approximating products are as follows (see proof of theorem 2).
 - (a) If $A \in \mathcal{F} \cup -\mathcal{F}$, then the associated product is $T(x) = e^{Ax}$ (only one factor).
 - (b) If $T(x)$ is the product associated with A , then $T^{-1}(x)$ is the product associated with $-A$.
 - (c) If $T(x)$ is the product associated with A , then $T(ax)$ is the product associated with aA for any $a \geq 0$.
 - (d) If $T_A(x)$ and $T_B(x)$ are the products associated with A and B respectively, then $T_A(x)T_B(x)$ is the product associated with $A + B$.
 - (e) If $T_A(x)$ and $T_B(x)$ are the products associated with A and B respectively, then $T_A^{-1}(\sqrt{x})T_B^{-1}(\sqrt{x})T_A(\sqrt{x})T_B(\sqrt{x})$ is the product associated with $[A, B]$.
4. Combine all the products in a unique product approximating e^{Hx} , which contains only exponentials of elements in $\mathcal{F}$ and $-\mathcal{F}$. By repeating this product for $x = \frac{1}{n}$ a large number of times n we obtain a matrix arbitrarily close to e^H .
5. Replace every exponential e^{At} with $A \in \mathcal{F}$ and $t < 0$ in the approximating product with an approximating exponential of the form $e^{A\bar{t}}$ with $\bar{t} > 0$, according to proposition 2.1 and remark 2.2.

3.1 Example

We illustrate the previous procedure with an example taken from the theory of electrical networks. In particular, we consider the LC switching network in [20] (see also [8]) whose

dynamical equation is given by

$$\dot{x} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\nu & 0 & 0 \\ \nu & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\beta \\ 0 & 0 & \beta & 0 \end{pmatrix} x + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & \gamma \\ 0 & 0 & \delta & 0 \\ 0 & -\delta & 0 & 0 \\ -\gamma & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} x u(t), \quad (47)$$

where ν, β, γ and δ are positive parameters depending the inductances and capacitances of the electrical network. The vector x represents voltages and currents in the network and u is a switching control variable which takes values in $\{0, 1\}$. To make the discussion concrete, we choose the parameters $\nu = 1, \beta = 3, \gamma = 1$ and $\delta = 2$, so that the set of available matrices is

$$\mathcal{F} := \left\{ A_1 := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 2 & 0 \\ 0 & -2 & 0 & -3 \\ -1 & 0 & 3 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad A_2 := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -3 \\ 0 & 0 & 3 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\}. \quad (48)$$

The solution of (47) is

$$x(t) = X(t)x(0), \quad (49)$$

where $X = X(t)$ is the solution of the matrix equation

$$\dot{X} = A(u)X, \quad X(0) = \mathbf{1}, \quad A(1) = A_1, \quad A(0) = A_2. \quad (50)$$

Let us use the notation E_{jk} for the skew-symmetric 4×4 matrix which has all the entries equal to zero except for the (jk) -th and (kj) -th ($1 \leq j < k \leq 4$) which are equal to 1 and -1 , respectively. Therefore, we can write

$$A_1 = -E_{12} + E_{14} + 2E_{23} - 3E_{34}, \quad A_2 = -E_{12} - 3E_{34}. \quad (51)$$

By calculating Lie brackets, at depth 1, we obtain

$$A_3 := [A_2, A_1] = -5E_{12} + 7E_{24}, \quad (52)$$

at depth 2

$$A_4 := [A_3, A_1] = 17E_{12} + 22E_{14} + 26E_{23} + 19E_{34}, \quad \text{and} \quad A_5 := [A_3, A_2] = 22E_{14} + 26E_{23}. \quad (53)$$

At depth 3, we obtain

$$A_6 := [A_4, A_1] = 145E_{13} - 155E_{24}. \quad (54)$$

As the matrices $\{A_l\}$, $l = 1, \dots, 6$, are linearly independent, they span all of $so(4)$ and system (50) varies on the Lie group $SO(4)$, a compact Lie group.

Let us denote by $T_j = T_j(x)$ the products approximating $e^{A_j x}$, $j = 1, \dots, 6$, and let us assume that the control problem is to transfer the state $[0, 0, 0, 1]^T$ to $[1, 0, 0, 0]^T$. We choose to drive the transition matrix X in (50) to the value

$$e^{A_5 \frac{\pi}{44}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & \cos(\frac{13\pi}{22}) & \sin(\frac{13\pi}{22}) & 0 \\ 0 & -\sin(\frac{13\pi}{22}) & \cos(\frac{13\pi}{22}) & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (55)$$

We proceed using the composition rules illustrated in (a)-(e) above. Since $A_5 = [A_3, A_2]$, we have

$$T_5(x) = T_3^{-1}(\sqrt{x})T_2^{-1}(\sqrt{x})T_3(\sqrt{x})T_2(\sqrt{x}). \quad (56)$$

Moreover, since $A_3 = [A_2, A_1]$ we have

$$T_3(x) = T_2^{-1}(\sqrt{x})T_1^{-1}(\sqrt{x})T_2(\sqrt{x})T_1(\sqrt{x}), \quad (57)$$

and replacing into (56), we obtain

$$T_5(x) = T_1^{-1}(\sqrt[4]{x})T_2^{-1}(\sqrt[4]{x})T_1(\sqrt[4]{x})T_2(\sqrt[4]{x})T_2^{-1}(\sqrt{x})T_2^{-1}(\sqrt[4]{x})T_1^{-1}(\sqrt[4]{x})T_2(\sqrt[4]{x})T_1(\sqrt[4]{x})T_2(\sqrt{x}). \quad (58)$$

The product approximating $e^{A_5 \frac{\pi}{44}t}$ is $T_5(\frac{\pi}{44}t)$ which we can express in terms of exponentials of A_1 and A_2 only by replacing T_1 and T_2 (and T_1^{-1} and T_2^{-1}) according to the rules in (a) and (b) above. In conclusion, we have

$$T_5\left(\frac{\pi}{44}t\right) = e^{-A_1(\frac{\pi}{44}t)^{\frac{1}{4}}}e^{-A_2(\frac{\pi}{44}t)^{\frac{1}{4}}}e^{A_1(\frac{\pi}{44}t)^{\frac{1}{4}}}e^{A_2(\frac{\pi}{44}t)^{\frac{1}{4}}}e^{-A_2(\frac{\pi}{44}t)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \times \\ e^{-A_2(\frac{\pi}{44}t)^{\frac{1}{4}}}e^{-A_1(\frac{\pi}{44}t)^{\frac{1}{4}}}e^{A_2(\frac{\pi}{44}t)^{\frac{1}{4}}}e^{A_1(\frac{\pi}{44}t)^{\frac{1}{4}}}e^{A_2(\frac{\pi}{44}t)^{\frac{1}{2}}}. \quad (59)$$

We numerically calculated the error

$$Err^2(n) = \left\| e^{A_5 \frac{\pi}{44}} - \left[T_5\left(\frac{\pi}{44} \frac{1}{n}\right) \right]^n \right\|^2 = 8 - 2Tr \left[\left(T_5\left(\frac{\pi}{44} \frac{1}{n}\right) \right)^n e^{A_5^T \frac{\pi}{44}} \right], \quad (60)$$

for various values of n and the behavior of the Error as a function of the number of iterations n is reported in Table 1. The error goes to zero as predicted by the above treatment. In a log-log scale the behavior is essentially linear.

To conclude the example we have to solve the problem that negative times are not allowed and therefore we have to replace terms of the form $e^{-A_1 x}$ and $e^{-A_2 x}$, with $x > 0$ in the expression of T_5 with approximations of the form $e^{A_1 x}$ and $e^{A_2 x}$, respectively. In the case of A_2 , since $\{e^{A_2 t} | t \in \mathbf{R}\}$ is periodic we can always find $x_1 > 0$ such that $e^{-A_2 x} = e^{A_2 x_1}$ for every x , and we can simply replace the exponential with x with the exponential with x_1 in T_5 , without changing the error. For the exponentials of A_1 however we need to find an approximation and this is always possible with arbitrary accuracy according to proposition 2.1 and remark 2.2.

To be concrete let us assume that the maximum error we can tolerate is 0.4. From Table 1, we choose $n = 10^5$. Fix $x := \frac{\pi}{44}10^{-5}$. We have (cf. (60) and Table 1)

$$Err(10^5) = \left\| e^{A_5 \frac{\pi}{44}} - (T_5(x))^{10^5} \right\| < 0.235. \quad (61)$$

Let $\tilde{T}_5$ be the approximation of T_5 in (59) where we only use positive values in the exponentials, appropriately replacing the exponentials of A_1 . In particular, by rewriting $T_5(x)$ in (59) as

$$T_5(x) = e^{-A_1 x^{\frac{1}{4}}} \Pi_1(x) e^{-A_1 x^{\frac{1}{4}}} \Pi_2(x), \quad (62)$$

Table 1: Results of numerical experiments for the method in section 3.

number of iterations n	Error $\bar{Err}$
2	3.1531
10	2.3964
20	2.0500
30	1.8604
100	1.3761
500	0.9089
1000	0.7599
5000	0.5022
50000	0.2791
100000	0.2341
500000	0.1558
1000000	0.1301
5000000	0.0873
10000000	0.0733
50000000	0.0490
100000000	0.0411

with $\Pi_1(x) = e^{-A_2 x^{\frac{1}{4}}} e^{A_1 x^{\frac{1}{4}}} e^{A_2 x^{\frac{1}{4}}} e^{-A_2 x^{\frac{1}{2}}} e^{-A_2 x^{\frac{1}{4}}}$ and $\Pi_2(x) = e^{A_2 x^{\frac{1}{4}}} e^{A_1 x^{\frac{1}{4}}} e^{A_2 x^{\frac{1}{2}}}$, we have

$$\tilde{T}_5 := \tilde{T}_5(x_1, x) = e^{A_1 x_1} \Pi_1(x) e^{A_1 x_1} \Pi_2(x). \quad (63)$$

Therefore the actual error $\tilde{Err}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{Err} &= \left\| e^{A_5 \frac{\pi}{44}} - [\tilde{T}_5(x, x_1)]^{10^5} \right\| \leq \left\| e^{A_5 \frac{\pi}{44}} - [T_5(x)]^{10^5} \right\| + \left\| [T_5(x)]^{10^5} - [\tilde{T}_5(x, x_1)]^{10^5} \right\| \\ &< 0.235 + \left\| [T_5(x)]^{10^5} - [\tilde{T}_5(x, x_1)]^{10^5} \right\|, \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

where we used (61). Using the formula for A and B unitary matrices⁵

$$\|A^n - B^n\| \leq n \|A - B\|, \quad (65)$$

we write

$$\tilde{Err} < 0.235 + 10^5 \|T_5(x) - \tilde{T}_5(x, x_1)\|. \quad (66)$$

⁵This formula is proved by writing $A^n - B^n = \sum_{k=1}^n A^{n-k} (A - B) B^{k-1}$, which gives

$$\|A^n - B^n\| \leq \sum_{k=1}^n \|A^{n-k} (A - B) B^{k-1}\| = n \|A - B\|,$$

since multiplication (right or left) by a unitary matrix does not modify the Frobenius norm.

In view of our bound on the error of 0.4, we need to find $x_1 > 0$ so that $\|T_5(x) - \tilde{T}_5(x, x_1)\| \leq 0.165 \times 10^{-5}$. Now, we have

$$\|T_5 - \tilde{T}_5\| = \left\| e^{-A_1 x^{\frac{1}{4}}} \Pi_1 e^{-A_1 x^{\frac{1}{4}}} \Pi_2 - e^{A_1 x_1} \Pi_1 e^{A_1 x_1} \Pi_2 \right\| = \left\| \Pi_1 - e^{A_1(x^{\frac{1}{4}} + x_1)} \Pi_1 e^{A_1(x^{\frac{1}{4}} + x_1)} \right\|. \quad (67)$$

Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|T_5 - \tilde{T}_5\| &\leq \left\| \Pi_1 - e^{A_1(x^{\frac{1}{4}} + x_1)} \Pi_1 \right\| \\ &+ \left\| e^{A_1(x^{\frac{1}{4}} + x_1)} \Pi_1 - e^{A_1(x^{\frac{1}{4}} + x_1)} \Pi_1 e^{A_1(x^{\frac{1}{4}} + x_1)} \right\| = 2 \left\| \mathbf{1} - e^{A_1(x^{\frac{1}{4}} + x_1)} \right\|. \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

Therefore, we need to find $x_1 \geq 0$ so that

$$\left\| \mathbf{1} - e^{A_1(x^{\frac{1}{4}} + x_1)} \right\| \leq \frac{0.165 \times 10^{-5}}{2}. \quad (69)$$

We calculate explicitly the eigenvalues of A_1 which are given by $\pm ir$ and $\pm il$, with r and l given by

$$r := \sqrt{\frac{15 + \sqrt{125}}{2}}, \quad l := \sqrt{\frac{15 - \sqrt{125}}{2}}. \quad (70)$$

We have

$$\left\| \mathbf{1} - e^{A_1(x^{\frac{1}{4}} + x_1)} \right\| = 2\sqrt{1 - \cos(r(x^{\frac{1}{4}} + x_1)) + 1 - \cos(l(x^{\frac{1}{4}} + x_1))}. \quad (71)$$

Therefore, setting $t := x^{\frac{1}{4}} + x_1$, formula (69) is certainly satisfied if

$$1 - \cos(rt) < 8 \times 10^{-14}, \quad (72)$$

and

$$1 - \cos(lt) < 8 \times 10^{-14}. \quad (73)$$

Setting $\epsilon := \arccos(1 - 8 \times 10^{-14})$, we need to find $t > x^{\frac{1}{4}}$, positive integers p and q such that

$$|rt - 2\pi p| < \epsilon, \quad |lt - 2\pi q| < \epsilon. \quad (74)$$

One way to do this is as follows. Fix an integer $k > 0$ large enough so that

$$\frac{1}{k} < \frac{\epsilon}{2\pi}. \quad (75)$$

According to Dirichlet's approximation theorem (see, e.g., [19] Theorem 1.3) we can find p and q , with $1 \leq p \leq k$ positive integers so that

$$\left| \frac{l}{r}p - q \right| < \frac{1}{k}. \quad (76)$$

Choose p and q this way and

$$t = \frac{2\pi p}{r}. \quad (77)$$

Using this value of t , the first one of (74) is verified because the left hand side becomes zero. Replacing this value of t in the second one of (74) and using (75) and (76) we obtain that the second inequality is satisfied as well. Moreover, since $q \geq 1$, we have that

$$t \geq \frac{2\pi}{r} \approx 1.7366 > x^{\frac{1}{4}} = \left(\frac{\pi}{44}10^{-5}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \approx 0.0291. \quad (78)$$

This concludes the example.

4 Combination of the two methods

The main ideas in the two methods of control described in the previous sections can be combined in a third method. The main idea of the method in Section 2 was to use similarity transformation to generate a basis of the dynamical Lie algebra $\mathcal{L}$ starting from the given matrices in $\mathcal{F}$ in (4) (cf. (9)). The main idea of the method in section 3 is the use of the limit in Lemma 3.2, once (24) holds. This allows us to control to the target, by repeating a given sequence of available exponentials, with arbitrary accuracy. We can combine the two ideas. We first use similarity transformations to obtain a basis of $\mathcal{L}$, $A_1, \dots, A_{\dim \mathcal{L}}$. Then, if e^H is the target and $H = \sum_{j=1}^{\dim \mathcal{L}} \alpha_j A_j$, we use the fact that

$$e^{Hx} = e^{\sum_{j=1}^{\dim \mathcal{L}} \alpha_j A_j x} = \prod_{j=1}^{\dim \mathcal{L}} e^{\alpha_j A_j x} + O(x^2), \quad (79)$$

along with Lemma 3.2 to approximate with arbitrary accuracy the target state, i.e.,

$$e^H = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[\prod_{j=1}^{\dim \mathcal{L}} e^{\alpha_j A_j \frac{1}{n}} \right]^n. \quad (80)$$

At the end of the process, we replace all the exponentials of the form $e^{A_j t}$ with $t < 0$ with approximating exponentials of the form $e^{A_j \bar{t}}$ with $\bar{t} > 0$.

We test this method on the example in subsection 3.1. Given A_1 and A_2 in (48) we calculate

$$F := e^{A_2 \frac{\pi}{2}} A_1 e^{-A_2 \frac{\pi}{2}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 & 2 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & -3 \\ -2 & 0 & 3 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (81)$$

Our target is $e^{A_5 \frac{\pi}{44}}$ in (55). We have the decomposition

$$A_5 = 10A_1 + 6F - 16A_2, \quad (82)$$

so that

$$e^{A_5 \frac{\pi}{44} x} = R_5(x) + O(x^2), \quad (83)$$

with

$$R_5(x) := e^{10A_1 \frac{\pi}{44} x} e^{6F \frac{\pi}{44} x} e^{-16A_2 \frac{\pi}{44} x}. \quad (84)$$

We have, according to Lemma 3.2,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[R_5 \left(\frac{1}{n} \right) \right]^n = e^{A_5 \frac{\pi}{44}}. \quad (85)$$

Table 2 shows the results of numerical experiments with this scheme displaying the error Err as a function of the number of iterations. Compared with Table 1, it is clear that this method converges much faster. Another advantage is that the all the exponentials e^{At} with negative t are for $A = A_2$ (cf. (84) and (81)) and the one dimensional subgroup associated with A_2 is closed. Therefore no further approximation is needed.

Table 2: Results of numerical experiments for the method in section 4.

number of iterations n	Error Err
2	2.2819
10	0.4544
20	0.2267
50	0.0906
100	0.0453
1000	0.0045
10000	0.0005

5 Conclusions

The methods described in this paper can be seen as a constructive proof of the Lie algebra rank condition of Theorem 1. It is expected that the ideas described above can be extended and improved by using more sophisticated exponential formulas [15], in many ways. It is also expected that it will be possible to obtain estimates of the convergence rate in various cases. Our goal here was to propose ideas that, although at an early stage, are very general and, in principle, allow us to control every system on a compact Lie group. These systems in particular include the important class of closed, finite dimensional, quantum systems which are coherently controlled, namely controlled through a change in the Hamiltonian.

In the future, it will be important to improve the algorithms by minimizing the number of switches in the control laws that mainly depends on the number of iterations, in the last two sections. In this respect, the algorithm of section 4 is expected to be faster than

the algorithm in section 3, as a consequence of the exponent 2, in the $O(x^2)$ in (79) as opposed to the exponent $1 + \delta$ (with δ typically < 1) in (24). If our main concern is however the time of implementation, the effect of an increasing number of iterations n in (26) is balanced by the $\frac{1}{n}$ exponents inside the limit. The main problem, in terms of time, is the approximation of matrices of the form e^{At} with $t < 0$ with matrices of the form e^{At} , with $t > 0$, in the case of non-closed subgroups. In fact, we might have to ‘travel’ for a long time inside the Lie group $e^{\mathcal{L}}$ before we get close enough to the original e^{At} . In special situations, however, it might be possible to transform A into $-A$ via available similarity transformations, or reduce ourselves to a smaller dimensional Lie subgroup where the problem is more easily tractable. Nevertheless, it is always possible to find such an approximation and therefore the control. Remark 2.2 shows how this problem can be reduced to a standard problem of Diophantine approximation in number theory for which there exist a vast literature and that can be always solved in principle.

In conclusion, would like to comment on the assumption of compactness which is used in the paper only in two instances. In particular, compactness is used to have a surjective exponential map and to be able to approximate an exponential of the form e^{At} with t negative with an exponential of the same type with t positive. Whenever these two properties hold, the methods of this paper can still be applied to more general Lie groups. In particular this is the case for finite dimensional closed quantum mechanical systems whose dynamical Lie algebra $\mathcal{L}$ is a subalgebra of $u(n)$.

Acknowledgment This research was supported by NSF under Grant ECCS0824085. The author would like to thank Y.T. Poon for suggesting formula (65). He also would like to thank Richard Ng for indicating the relevant literature on Diophantine approximation and Dirichlet’s approximation theorem, and for helpful discussions on this topic.

References

- [1] F. Albertini and D. D’Alessandro, Notions of controllability for bilinear multilevel quantum systems, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 48, No. 8, 1399-1403 (2003).
- [2] J. W. S. Cassels, *An Introduction to Diophantine Approximation.*, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics and Mathematical Physics, no. 35, New York, Cambridge University Press, 1957.
- [3] D. D’Alessandro, Connection Between Continuous and Discrete Time Quantum Walks on d -Dimensional Lattices; Extensions to General Graphs, Preprint, submitted for publication. arXiv:0902.3496
- [4] D. D’Alessandro, Optimal evaluation of generalized angles with applications to control, *Automatica*, 40, 1997-2002, (2004).

- [5] D. D'Alessandro, Uniform finite generation of compact Lie groups, *Systems and Control Letters*, 47, 87-90, (2002).
- [6] D. D'Alessandro, Lie algebraic analysis and control of quantum dynamics, preprint, submitted for publication.
- [7] D. D'Alessandro, *Introduction to Quantum Control and Dynamics*, CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 2007.
- [8] K. L. Flores and V. Ramakrishna, Control of switched networks via quantum methods, arXiv:quant-ph/0110001.
- [9] R. A. Horn and C. R. Johnson, *Topics in Matrix Analysis*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1994.
- [10] G. M. Huang, T. J. Tarn and J. W. Clark, On the controllability of quantum mechanical systems, *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 24 No. 11, 2608-2618, (1983).
- [11] V. Jurdjević and H. Sussmann, Control systems on Lie groups, *Journal of Differential Equations*, 12, 313-329, (1972).
- [12] W. Jurkat, W. Kratz and A. Peyerimhoff, On the best two-dimensional Dirichlet-Approximations and their algorithmic calculation, *Math. Ann.* **244**, 1-32 (1979).
- [13] B. Just, Generalizing the continued fraction algorithm to arbitrary dimensions, *SIAM J. Comput.* 21(5): 909-926 (1992)
- [14] A. Knapp, *Lie Groups: Beyond an Introduction*, 2nd ed., Birkhauser Boston, 2002.
- [15] C. Moler and C. Van Loan, Nineteen dubious ways to compute the exponential of a matrix, twentyfive years later, *SIAM Review*, Vol.45, No. 1, pp. 3-000, 2003.
- [16] M. Moskowitz and R. Sacksteder, The exponential map and differential equations on real Lie groups, *Journal of Lie Theory*, Volume **13**, (2003), 291-306.
- [17] T. Polack, H. Suchowski and D. J. Tannor, Uncontrollable quantum systems: A classification scheme based on Lie subalgebras, to appear in *Physical Review A*.
- [18] V. Ramakrishna, M. V. Salapaka, M. Dahleh, H. Rabitz and A. Peirce, Controllability of molecular systems, *Physical Review A*, 51, No. 2, 960-966, (1995).
- [19] K. H. Rosen, *Elementary Number Theory and its Applications*, 5-th edition, Addison Wesley, 2005.
- [20] J. Wood, Power conversion in electrical networks, Technical Report NASA Rep. No. CR-120830, 1973. Ph.D. thesis, Harvard University, 1974.